



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,981	09/26/2003	Brett P. Monia	ISPH-0786	1735
27180	7590	11/17/2005	EXAMINER	
ISIS PHARMACEUTICALS INC 1896 RUTHERFORD RD. CARLSBAD, CA 92008			SCHULTZ, JAMES	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1635	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/672,981	MONIA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	J. D. Schultz, Ph.D.	1635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>26 Sep 2003</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### *Specification*

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The application recites a priority statement in the first line of the specification to U.S. Application Number 09/973,827, filed 10 October 2001. This application has been abandoned, and the statement should be amended to indicate as much. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 26 September 2003 was filed before the mailing date of the instant action on the merits. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been considered by the examiner, and a signed copy is enclosed herewith.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The subject matter of the instantly claimed invention is drawn to antisense compounds that target the full length human CREB transcript and inhibit its expression.

At the outset it is noted that the rejected claim does not recite any sequence identifier relating to human CREB. The sequence is thus considered to be defined by its function (i.e. CREB activity), rather than by any specific structure. Accordingly the claim embraces antisense directed to any sequence of any human CREB, or any such mRNAs or genomic sequences or fragments known or yet to be discovered that provide for analogous CREB activity, along with any related isoform or allele present within any CREB, or any variant, polymorphic or otherwise, that is reasonably similar to CREB that retains CREB like activity.

To satisfy the written-description requirement, the specification must describe every element of the claimed invention in sufficient detail so that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the inventor possessed the claimed invention at the time of filing. Thus, an applicant complies with the written-description requirement by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, and by using such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that set forth the claimed invention. To provide adequate written description and evidence of possession of a claimed genus, the specification must provide sufficient distinguishing identifying characteristics of the genus. The factors to be considered include disclosure of complete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical, structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, and any combination thereof. The representative sample requirement may be satisfied by supplying structural or functional information, or a combination of both, such that one of skill in the art would be satisfied that

applicants were in possession of the genus as claimed. Further, the size of the representative sample required is an inverse function of the unpredictability of the art.

In order to synthesize the antisense compounds claimed that are directed to the genus of any full length human CREB mRNA, one of skill would first need to know the specific sequence in order to synthesize said antisense compounds. However, the specification does not teach a common core structure that is shared by a representative sample of all such members of the genus. Although the prior art does teach a full length sequence relating to human CREB, which is recited in claim 1, there is no evidence that there is a shared sequence that defines a genus of all such CREB sequences. In fact, each sequence is considered to be unique, and not predictive of any other sequence. Thus, in the lack of such a teaching of a common core structure, the presence of one or even few sequences in the prior art is not considered to meet the requirements for disclosure of a representative sample of structures that correlate to the genus of any molecule encompassing any human CREB mRNA, because knowledge of a few examples of related CREB sequences in the prior art is not considered to be predictive of other sequences that might encode for polypeptides with related activity. Accordingly, because one of skill in the art could not envision a representative sample of all target sequences of any human CREB other than the examples provided in the prior art, it follows that one of skill would not be persuaded that applicants were in possession of all antisense sequence against the a full length human CREB mRNA sequence that is heretofore undescribed.

Amendment of the claim to recite a specific SEQ ID NO: as a target would obviate this rejection.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for antisense-mediated inhibition of CREB expression *in vitro*, does not reasonably provide enablement for antisense-mediated inhibition of CREB expression *in vivo*, or for methods of treating diseases associated with its expression *in vivo*. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The above invention is drawn to methods of inhibiting the expression of CREB in cells or tissues comprising contacting said cells or tissues with antisense compositions that inhibit the expression of CREB wherein the language of said claims encompasses both *in vivo* and *in vitro* activity.

The specification teaches prophetic methods of treatment using antisense oligos targeted to CREB with broad treatment regimens that include pharmaceutical formulations, and treatment regimens comprising, for example, antisense administration at concentrations between 0.01 Tg to 100 g per kg of body weight, from once or more daily, weekly, monthly, or yearly, or even once every 2 to 20 years. The specification provides exemplifies only for methods of using the claimed compositions to inhibit the expression of CREB in cultured cells *in vitro*.

The specification as filed does not provide sufficient guidance or appropriate examples that would enable a skilled artisan to use the disclosed compounds or methods of using said compounds in *in vivo* environments. Additionally, a person skilled in the art would recognize that predicting the efficacy of an antisense compound *in vivo* based solely on its performance *in vitro* is unpredictable. Thus, although the specification prophetically considers and discloses general methodologies of using the claimed constructs *in vivo* or in methods of inhibition or

treatment, such a disclosure would not be considered enabling since the state of antisense-mediated gene inhibition is highly unpredictable. The factors listed below have been considered in the analysis of enablement:

- (A) The breadth of the claims;
- (B) The nature of the invention;
- (C) The state of the prior art;
- (D) The level of one of ordinary skill;
- (E) The level of predictability in the art;
- (F) The amount of direction provided by the inventor;
- (G) The existence of working examples; and
- (H) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The following references are cited herein to illustrate the state of the art of antisense treatment.

A recent (2002) review article by Braasch et al. concludes that major obstacles persist in the art of using antisense oligos in treating disease: “gene inhibition by antisense oligomers has not proven to be a robust or generally reliable technology. Many researchers are skeptical about the approach, and it has been suggested that many published studies are at least partially unreliable” (Pg. 4503, para. 1 and 2). Braasch et al. specifically identify 3 factors that contribute to the unpredictable efficacy of using antisense compounds in general: 1) the variable capability of antisense oligonucleotides to access sites within the mRNA to be targeted; 2) problems pertaining to the delivery and uptake of the antisense oligos by cells, with the result that “the difference in oligonucleotide dose required to inhibit expression is often not much different than doses that lead to nonselective toxicity and cell death”; and 3), that “oligonucleotides can bind to proteins and produce artifactual phenotypes that obscure effects due to the intended antisense mechanism.

Regarding the difficulties of predicting whether antisense oligonucleotides can access sites within their target mRNA, Braasch et al. elaborates, “it has been difficult to identify oligonucleotides that act as potent inhibitors of gene expression, primarily due to difficulties in predicting the secondary structures of RNA (Pg. 4503, para. 1 and 2). Branch adds that “internal structures of target RNAs and their associations with cellular proteins create physical barriers, which render most potential binding sites inaccessible to antisense molecules” (Page 45, third column). Additionally, in a review of the potential use of antisense oligos as therapeutic agents, Gewirtz et al. teach that the inhibitory activity of an oligo depends unpredictably on the sequence and structure of the nucleic acid target site and the ability of the oligo to reach its target, and that “[a]ttempts to describe the *in vivo* structure of RNA, in contrast to DNA, have been fraught with difficulty.” (Page 3161, second column).

The uptake of oligonucleotides by cells has been addressed by Agrawal, who states that “[o]ligonucleotides must be taken up by cells in order to be effective....several reports have shown that efficient uptake of oligonucleotides occurs in a variety of cell lines, including primary cells whereas other reports indicate negligible cellular uptake of oligonucleotides. Cellular uptake of oligonucleotides is complex process; it depends on many factors, including the cell type, the stage of the cell cycle, the concentration of serum. It is therefore, difficult to generalize that all oligonucleotides are taken up in all cells with the same efficiency” (Page 378). “[M]icroinjection or using lipid carriers to supply an oligonucleotide in cell culture increases the potency of the oligonucleotide in cell culture, but it is not clear how relevant this approach is for *in vivo* situations.” (Page 379). Gewirtz adds that [t]he other major problem in this field is the ability to deliver ODN (oligodeoxynucleotides) into cells and have them reach their target .

Without this ability, it is clear that even an appropriately targeted sequence is not likely to be efficient."

Branch et al. discuss the problems pertaining to non-specific oligo interactions that lead to artifactual phenotypes during *in vivo* antisense administration: "non-antisense effects are not currently predictable, rules for rational design cannot be applied to the production of non-antisense drugs, These effects must be explored on a case by case basis" (Page 50), while Tamm et al. states that "[i]mmune stimulation is widely recognized as an undesirable side-effect...the immunostimulatory activity of a phosphorothioate-modified oligonucleotide is largely unpredictable and has to be ascertained experimentally" (page 493, right column).

Further, regarding the therapeutic benefit of antisense technology in general, Branch states that "in fact, nucleic acid drugs should not be thought of as magic bullets. Their therapeutic use will require vigilant monitoring. Compared to the dose response curves of conventional drugs, which typically span two to three orders of magnitude, those of antisense drugs extend only across a narrow concentration range. Both *in vitro* and *in vivo*, less than a factor of ten often separates the concentration producing no antisense effect from that producing the full antisense effect. Steep dose-response curves commonly indicate that a drug has multiple, synergistic mechanisms of action. A drug with a narrow therapeutic window can be potent and extremely valuable, but can also be tricky to use safely. Since the ratio of antisense to non-antisense effects drops sharply outside a restricted concentration range, it will be challenging to obtain consistent therapeutic benefit (Page 46, second column).

Tamm et al. concludes by stating that until "the therapeutic activity of an antisense oligonucleotide is defined by the antisense sequence, and thus is to some extent

Art Unit: 1635

predictable...antisense will not be better than other drug development strategies, most of which depend on an empirical approach."

Finally, Branch states that "[i]t is not yet clear whether *in vitro* screening techniques of the sort used by Milner and co-workers will identify ODNs that are effective *in vivo*. With so many possible sequences to choose from, and the likelihood that *in vitro* studies will not always predict *in vivo* efficacy, straightforward new screening techniques need to be developed for use in cells."

Thus, it is maintained that the prior art at the time of applicants' filing would not enable the use of *in vitro* antisense screening techniques to support claims directed to the *in vivo* use of antisense, let alone claims directed to therapeutic use *in vivo*. Accordingly, one skilled in the art, being unable to use the prior art for such guidance, must necessarily find such guidance from the specification. However, one of skill would not find the guidance provided in the specification in the form of *in vitro* examples and broad prophetic treatment regimens enough to overcome the unpredictability and challenges of applying results from *in vitro* experiments to the *in vivo* treatment of disease, or *in vivo* methods of inhibition, as exemplified in the references above.

This is particularly true in view of the fact that the specification as filed fails to provide any particular guidance which resolves the known unpredictability in the art associated with appropriate *in vivo* delivery of the antisense administered, and specifically regarding the instant compositions and methods claimed.

In order to practice the invention using the specification and the state of the prior art as outlined above, the quantity of experimentation required to practice the invention as claimed *in vivo* would require the *de novo* determination of those sequences that are successfully delivered

Art Unit: 1635

to target sites in appropriate cells and /or tissues such that inhibition is achieved. Since the specification fails to provide any real guidance for the methods of using antisense *in vivo*, and since resolution of the various complications in regards to targeting a particular gene in an organism is unpredictable, one of skill in the art would have been unable to practice the invention without engaging in undue trial and error experimentation. In the absence of any real guidance from the specification, the amount of experimentation would be undue, and one would have been unable to practice the invention over the scope claimed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 that form the basis for the rejections under these sections made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

102(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

103(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Chenchik et al. (U. S. Patent Number 5,994,076).

The claims of the above invention are drawn to antisense compounds 8 to 50 nucleotides in length that specifically hybridize with and optionally inhibits the expression of human CREB.

SEQ ID NO: 686 possesses 100% complementarity to nucleotides 827 to 853 of SEQ ID NO: 3 of the instant application, and would thus specifically hybridize with human CREB.

Art Unit: 1635

Although this reference does not specifically teach the function of inhibiting human CREB as claimed in claim 1, the above-listed compound of the prior art meets all the structural limitations as set forth in the instant claims. Furthermore, this fragment is used in a PCR assay that is carried out in suitable buffers, which are also considered to be pharmaceutically acceptable as diluents. Because the sequence and compounds meet all the structural limitations of the instant claims, they are considered to be substantially identical to applicant's claimed compounds, and in the absence of evidence to the contrary the sequence and compounds of the prior art are thus considered to possess the functional limitations of specifically hybridizing with and inhibiting the expression of human CREB. Support for this conclusion is drawn from MPEP § 2112:

Where applicant claims a composition in terms of a function, property or characteristic and the composition of the prior art is the same as that of the claim **but the function is not explicitly disclosed by the reference, the examiner may make a rejection under both 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, expressed as a 102/103 rejection.** "There is nothing inconsistent in concurrent rejections for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 and for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102." *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255 n.4, 195 USPQ 430, 433 n.4 (CCPA 1977). This same rationale should also apply to product, apparatus, and process claims claimed in terms of function, property or characteristic. Therefore, a 35 U.S.C. 102/103 rejection is appropriate for these types of claims as well as for composition claims. *Emphasis supplied.*

In rejecting the claims of the above under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, a *prima facie* case has been established by the examiner whereby the burden of proof in showing that the claimed compounds are not anticipated by the compound of the prior art as stated lies with the applicant, as per MPEP 2112.01:

Where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977). When the PTO shows a sound basis for believing that the products of the applicant and the prior art are the same, the applicant has the burden of showing that they are not. *In re Spada*, 911 F.2d 705, 709, 15 USPQ2d 1655, 1658 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Therefore, the *prima facie* case can be rebutted by evidence showing that the prior art products do not necessarily possess the characteristics of the claimed product. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d at 1255, 195 USPQ at 433.

Thus, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the antisense compounds of the above claims of the instant application are considered anticipated and/or obvious as outlined above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sato-Bigbee et al. (J. Neurosci. Res. 1996. 46:98-107, item “AV” on applicants IDS of 26 September 2003).

The claims of the above invention are drawn to nucleotide oligos 8 to 50 nucleobases long that hybridize with at least an 8-nucleobase portion of CREB.

Sato-Bigbee et al. describe a nucleotide oligo 24 nucleotides long that is 95% identical over a 20 nucleotide span. The instant disclosure indicates that an antisense oligo of the instant invention need not hybridize over the entire length of the oligo or target, and that a 100% hybridization match is not necessary for inhibition of expression to occur. Therefore, the oligo of Sato-Bigbee et al. meets the limitations of the instant claims which recite an oligo that will hybridize with and inhibit CREB of SEQ ID NO: 3.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sheriff et al. (Reg. Pept. 1998. 75-76:309-318, item “AX” on applicants IDS of 26 September 2003).

The claims are drawn to the invention as described above.

Sheriff et al. teach an oligo 20 nucleotides long that hybridizes with CREB of SEQ ID NO: 3.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, and 4-15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheriff et al., or Sato-Bigbee et al., as set forth above against claim 11, in view of Habener et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,919,649), Taylor et al. (Drug Disc. Today, 1999. 4(12)562-567), Baracchini *et al.* (U. S. Patent Number 5,801,154) and Bennett (U. S. Patent Number 5,998,148).

The invention of the above claims is drawn to antisense compounds that target human CREB of SEQ ID NO: 3, and to said compounds comprising internucleoside (i.e. phosphorothioate), sugar (i.e. 2'-O-methoxyethyl), nucleobase (i.e. 5-methylcytosine) and to

Art Unit: 1635

chimeras of said compounds, and compositions comprising said compounds and pharmaceutically acceptable diluents or colloidal dispersion systems thereof, and methods of use.

Habener et al. teach the cDNA sequence encoding CREB. Habener et al. does not teach antisense sequences comprising internucleoside, nucleobase, and 2' modifications, chimeras, or compositions comprising said compounds and pharmaceutically acceptable diluents or delivery systems thereof.

Both Sheriff et al. and Sato-Bigbee et al. both teach antisense compounds and methods that target CREB and inhibit its expression. Neither Sheriff et al. nor Sato-Bigbee et al. teach antisense sequences that target the coding sequence, or those compounds comprising linkage, nucleobase, and 2' modifications, chimeras, or compositions comprising said compounds and pharmaceutically acceptable diluents or delivery systems thereof.

Taylor et al. teach that antisense oligonucleotides 7-30 nucleotides long can be synthesized to inhibit the expression of any protein provided the cDNA sequence is known. Taylor et al. also indicate that making and using such oligos are available to those of ordinary skill in the art, that it is common practice to chemically modify the such oligonucleotides to prolong their bioactivity, and also teach that with software analysis and high affinity oligos, one needs to screen only 3-6 oligos to find one that inhibits its target 66-95% (p. 565).

Baracchini et al. teach that antisense oligonucleotides can be used for research purposes, and also teach that preferred antisense oligonucleotides are modified in their sugar, backbone linkage and nucleobase composition (col. 6). Baracchini teaches that such modifications are desirable in antisense oligos because these modifications have desirable properties such as enhanced cellular uptake, enhanced affinity for nucleic acid targets and increased stability in the

presence of nucleases. Baracchini et al provide specific embodiments of such modifications at columns 6-8 and in Example 1. These specific examples taught by Baracchini et al include the presently claimed phosphorothioate linkages, 2'-O-methoxyethyl sugars, 5-methylcytosine and chimeric oligonucleotides. Tables 1-4 show the successful design and use of modified oligonucleotides in cells in culture. Table 1 exemplifies the successful practice of general antisense design taught at columns 8-10. Column 4 teaches various carriers for antisense delivery. Baracchini *et al.* also teaches at column 8 that antisense oligonucleotides are preferably 8 to 30 nucleotides and that it is more preferable to make antisense oligonucleotides that are 12 to 25 nucleotides in length. Baracchini is considered to comprise a detailed blueprint for how to make and use inhibitory antisense oligos to target any known gene.

The teachings of Bennett *et al.* are considered to parallel those of Baracchini *et al.* Bennett *et al.* teaches general antisense targeting guidelines at columns 3-4. Bennett *et al.* also teaches targeting 5'-untranslated regions, start codons, coding regions, and 3'-untranslated regions of a desired target. Bennett teaches, in column 5, for example, that antisense compounds are commonly used as research reagents and diagnostics. Column 5 indicates that antisense oligonucleotides 8-30 nucleotides in length are particularly preferred. Columns 6-7 teach that preferred antisense oligonucleotides contain modified internucleoside linkages including phosphorothioate linkages, among others. Columns 7-8 teach that preferred antisense oligonucleotides comprise modified sugar moieties including 2'-O-methoxyethyl. Bennett *et al.* also teach one of ordinary skill to modify nucleobases in antisense oligonucleotides, including the teaching of 5-methylcytosine (col. 8-9), and also to use chimeric antisense oligonucleotides (col. 9-10). Bennett *et al.* teach that the above modifications are known in the art to provide

beneficial attributes to antisense oligonucleotides such as increased hybridization and nuclease protection, for example. Columns 10-24 teach numerous “carriers” for antisense oligonucleotides. Table 1 teaches the successful targeting of those regions taught in columns 3-4 with chimeric phosphorothioate oligonucleotides having 2'-MOE (a 2'-O-methoxyethyl modification). Thus, Bennett *et al.* is also considered to comprise a detailed blueprint for how to make and use inhibitory antisense oligos to target any known gene.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the cDNA sequence of Habener et al. (applicants' SEQ ID NO: 3) to generate antisense sequences as taught by Sheriff et al. or Sato-Bigbee et al. for inhibition of CREB expression, and further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate modifications as taught by Baracchini et al. and Bennett into said antisense compounds.

One would have been motivated to create such compounds because Sheriff et al. or Sato-Bigbee et al. expressly teach antisense compounds that target and hybridize to CREB (applicants' SEQ ID NO: 3). One would have been motivated to target the coding region because both Baracchini et al. and Bennett et al. teach that the coding region is a preferred targeting region. One would have been motivated to modify said antisense compounds as taught by Baracchini et al. and Bennett et al., because both teach that such modifications increase an antisense compound's cellular uptake, target affinity and resistance to degradation.

Finally, one would have a reasonable expectation of success given that Taylor teaches that with software analysis and high affinity oligos, one needs to screen only 3-6 oligos to find one that inhibits its target 66-95%, and since Baracchini *et al.* and Bennett *et al.* both teach

making modified antisense compounds targeted to distinct regions of a target gene, the steps of which are routine to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Thus in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the invention as a whole would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Douglas Schultz, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0763. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Wang can be reached at 571-272-0811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables

Art Unit: 1635

applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

JDS

*J.D. Schultz*  
**J.D. SCHULTZ, Ph.D.  
PATENT EXAMINER**